xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx 473-8186

New address: Route 7
Frederick, Md. 21701

December 29, 1967

Mr. J. R. Wiggins
Editor, The Washington Post
1515 L St., NW
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Wiggins:

Suicide generally is regarded as a sign of mental instability if not outright sickness. When the late, properly respected Philip Graham committed suicide, I recall no Washington Post apology to its readers because control of its policies and contents had been vested in a man who was, at least, sick and unstable. None was called for. However, the Post should be consistent. It is not.

When you received a UPI dispatch November 15 charging and documenting with previously suppressed evidence the CIA involvement in the New Orleans aspects of the Kennedy assassination, you found this unworthy of the consideration of your readers (here you were quite consistent, for you had also failed to inform them of the appearance of the book that brought forth this suppressed evidence, as you had its two similar predecessors).

Yet, when the Chicago Tribune supplied you a clearly libelous attack on Jim Garrison, this suddenly became front-page news. Unlike other papers, you did not check out this story.

There are a number of immediately obvious things about it, aside from its clearly libelous intent.

It could have come only from official sources. It is the kind of information official sources are not permitted to release. It is much more of this character than what, with the lusty collaboration of the defaulting paper you edit, the government continues to suppress about the murder of the President you pretended to respect and admire. Have you no question that the government leaked this libel?

Have you no question about the "coincidence" that it did this a) after Garrison documented the charge of suppression - unknown to the readers of the Washington Post; and b) less than two months before the scheduled trial of the defendant who seems to have exhausted all possible delays and to have invented a few, a defendant identified in the public press as of CIA connection?

Had you pursued this with the vigor you reserve for attacks on those who, like Garrison, say the government did less than it could and should have in the official "investigation" of the murder that put it in office, you might easily have learned that this story was first leaked by a man who has proclaimed his CIA connection, through his lawyer who, again from the papers, is being paid by the CIA.

Government secrets that are libelous and leaked by a government agent - more "coincidence"?

From your story alone, the libelous nature and intent and the factual error are clear. Garrison was so "unfit" for military duty that he was welcomed back and twice promoted, rising to the rank of lieutenant-colonel. How "unfit" can one be, really, to receive regular promotions and end a colonel?

And he has so severe a "chronic exhaustion syndrome" that in the span of five days I worked with him until about 2 a.m. and the next day saw him at his desk at the regular time. "Exhaustion syndrome"? Just how "exhausted" can a man be to do this regularly?

Odd that you did not mention Garrison's record as district attorney - or as the "exhausted" or "unfit" vote-getter who gets himself re-elected and cleans up a major city, fighting the judges to do so and going to the Supreme Court for vindication - and getting it. Or that he risked his future to effect the release of a stripper he had convicted when he realized it was not just and that she had two children who needed her. Or, in this specific case, where the involvement of homosexuals is unmistakable, that he has shunned any witch-hunting or intimidation of those so easily intimidated.

There was once a time I thought the Post motivated by honor and decency, simply wrong, as we all can be. Your record now makes this impossible, for the bias is as blatant as the whores Garrison chased out of New Orleans. You have made yourself the handmaiden of erring officialdom, the least respectable thing a newspaper can be.

This is not the way to make the country strong, recapture its honor, defend the President (who is thought Macbeth by an increasing number of citizens every time such smears are printed), solve the unsolved murder, and neither it nor any other slanders can validate the fake inquest that no one save such learned fools as eminent editors any longer pretends to believe.

If there is nothing I can do about it but make a record, Mr. Wiggins, that I will do. For when, as ultimately it will be, the truth is out, the people will know how and by whom they were deceived.

Until then, despite your incredible abdication of a sacred responsibility, my initial offer to you, to give you the proof of any of the many disproofs of the Warren Report I have already published, stands. If I thought I could trust you - as once I did - I would include my completed but unpublished POST-MORTEM. Its publication will have to await my ability to survive additional debt. But, then, you would not read it and your paper would not acknowledge its existence. It is easier to oppose what you do not know, isn't it?

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg